

This document lists all RFIs and associated City responses for the Del Amo Blvd Extension, T-30 (B2010-12).

Bidder Question #1: The purpose of this communication is to request that the specification for the above referenced project (Del Amo Blvd Extension, T-30) be modified to include the use of the Landmark Retaining Wall system which is a Caltrans Pre-approved alternative earth retaining wall system. (Question submitted on 06/07/2010 and relates to Special Provisions Section: 300-13.1 Mechanically Stabilized Earth Walls, Page E-65.)

City Response #1: Although the "Landmark Reinforced Soil Wall System" is shown on the Caltrans List for Pre-Approved Alternative Earth Retention Systems, it is approved only for a 4-degree batter design, not a true vertical (zero-degree) design. The City's design is specifically for a true vertical (zero-degree) design, due to right-of-way limitations. Therefore, Landmark Reinforced Soil Wall System is considered not to be an alternative. Only systems that meet both the requirements of the Special Provisions and are approved by Caltrans on or before the bid opening date can be considered acceptable for this contract.

Bidder Question #2: I would like to confirm the model numbers for the irrigation controllers, Rain Bird ESP-12SAT and an ESP-32 SAT, and the style of enclosure, front entrance or top? Do you require flow sensing or remote control? (Question submitted on 06/15/2010 and relates to: Irrigation Plan Sheets, Pages 14, 16, & 19 [I-101, I-103, & I-106].)

City Response #2: The City has specified a Rain Bird ESP-12SAT to be installed in a Stainless Steel Enclosure (see Plan Sheet 19; I-106) and a Rain Bird 32 Station Controller in a Stainless Steel Cabinet Enclosure (see Plan Sheet 16; I-103). The City's preference is the front entrance cabinet and flow sensing controller.

Bidder Question #3: What licensing requirements are there to perform the work? (Question submitted on 06/16/2010.)

City Response #3: The City calls for a Class "A" Contractors' license to bid the project. Please also refer to Instructions to Bidders and the QUALIFICATION OF BIDDERS section on page B-1.

Bidder Question #4: Is the enclosure for the irrigation controller on the irrigation plan pages need a metered enclosure or is the meter separate from the enclosure? (Question submitted on 06/18/2010. See Irrigation Plan Sheets, Pages 14, 16 and 19 [I-101, I-103, & I-106]).

City Response #4: The meter for the irrigation controller will be separate from the enclosure.

Bidder Question #5: Page C-29 states that the UDBE commitment form must be submitted with the bid proposal and failure to submit the required UDBE commitment will be grounds for the City to find the Bid Proposal non-responsive. Page C-18 and C-33 states that the UDBE commitment form must be received within four business days. Normal practice is four business days. We request page C-29 be revised to reflect this.

City Response #5: The statement on page C-29 of "This information must be submitted with your bid proposal" is not meant to require this information be submitted with the sealed bid proposal. Instead, the information can be submitted within four business days (per pages C-18 and C-33) after the bid opening and be considered a part of the bid proposal.

Bidder Question #6: Please clarify if our understanding of work responsibilities is correct. Reference Sheet TR-203 and Spec Section 316. From station 11+06.33 to 17+30: New 9' ties, relay 80' long 115-lb relay rail, new or second hand double shoulder plates, new ballast on new subballast all constructed by contractor. From station 10+00 to 11+06.33 and 17+30 to 19+71.96: Existing rail and ties supplemented with 25 ties supplied by the contractor and installed by BNSF.

City Response #6: The City's Contractor is responsible only for furnishing and installing material between STA 11+06.33 to STA 17+30.00. BNSF is responsible for furnishing and installing material between STA 10+00.00 to STA 11+06.33 and between STA 17+30.00 to STA 19+71.96.

Bidder Question #7: Are we able to get digital files for the grading plans for takeoff purposes? Are there cross sections (digital or hard copy) available for this project?

City Response #7: The AutoCAD files are available upon request and can be emailed to an email account capable of receiving an email of approximately 10MB.

Bidder Question #8: Bid Proposal-Will a revised document be sent? The numbering sequence for items following item 138 revert back to #133, etc. Also, there are two bid items #20. What is the allowance amount for item 22?

City Response #8: Please refer to Addendum #2, Item #3.

Bidder Question #9: Rail Road Flagmen-The specification and Exhibit C-1 are not clear about who pays the cost, is the contractor responsible?

City Response #9: Please refer to Addendum #2, Item #7. Please refer to Addendum #7, Item #2.

Bidder Question #10: Exxonmobil Gate Arms-Who installs these? Please provide details and specifications if we are responsible for this work. Also, item 161 addresses electrical work but again we need detailed information.

City Response #10: The City's contractor will install the gates and related appurtenances. However, the equipment will be provided by others. Please refer to Addendum #2, Item #4.

Bidder Question #11: MSE Wall- What is the thickness and width of the concrete leveling pads? Refer to page E-70.

City Response #11: Please refer to Addendum #2, Item #9.

Bidder Question #12: Approach slabs-How thick is the CTB under the approach slabs on page E-82 of the specifications?

City Response #12: Please refer to Sheet S-115 and Section A-A.

Bidder Question #13: Traffic Control-Will we be able to close the existing road between Madrona & Maple for the duration of this project?

City Response #13: The City acknowledges that Del Amo Blvd between Madrona and Maple Ave requires either partial or full closure for some items of work and for specified time periods. However, due to the need to maintain the capability of response by police, fire and medical services; city services and access to local businesses, partial and full closures are subject to City approval. The contractor awarded the contract will be required to propose a sequence of work for this road segment, including a traffic control and detour plan that conforms to the CA Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices. The City will evaluate all proposals and traffic control/detour plans submitted by the contractor. Also, access to the property/driveway on the north side of Del Amo Blvd and just west of the intersection with Maple Avenue needs to be accommodated at all times. This is included in Section 7-10.1.2, subparagraphs d and f on page E-32.

Bidder Question #14: Sequence of Construction-Can the storm drain between Maple and Madrona be installed prior to base paving? Refer to page E-24 items 1 & 2.

City Response #14: Yes, please refer to Addendum #2, Item #8.

Bidder Question #15: Barrier Lighting Fixtures-Page E-90 calls for light fixtures as included in the payment price per lineal foot for barrier. Please advise if this is correct and where this is on the plans with details.

City Response #15: Please refer to Addendum #2, Item #10.

Bidder Question #16: Slope Protection-Page E-90 calls for the work to comply with Section 72 of Cal Trans specifications. This section allows for Rock Facing or Concrete. Please advise which type is required and what plan this is on.

City Response #16: Please refer to Addendum #4, Item #5.

Bidder Question #17: Signal Pole Removal & Salvage-Please see sheet E-102. Do we remove the signal pole at +/- 23+00 and where is plan 'PD-103' note on this plan?

City Response #17: Please refer to Addendum #2, Item #1.

Bidder Question #18: What is the anticipated number of trains per day on the existing tracks?

City Response #18: Approximately 4 trains per day travel the rail and at an average speed of 10MPH.

Bidder Question #19: The Supplement Soil Investigation dated July 20, 2009 states hazardous chemicals have been found in the soil at the DOW site, DOW-SB1 & DOW-SB4. Please see 'Results of June 2009...' This report does not give the level on chemical contamination and we have concerns about the worker's health. Is there more specific data available? Will payment for offsite export be paid for in item #9 if we encounter this material during excavation?

City Response #19: Data obtained subsequent to remediation activities has been posted to the project website as [Report on Limited Remedial Excavation Activity - December 2009](#). For offsite export, refer to Section 3-4.1 "Payment" in the Special Provisions for how this item will be paid.

Bidder Question #20: Please refer to sheet S-211, Typical Barrier Slab Detail. Can the two conduits shown to be cast in the slab be moved to the roadway? These appear to be for future use and access/ intercepting them at a late date if needed will be less costly.

City Response #20: Bidders shall bid this work to be installed as shown on the plans.

Bidder Question #21: Will the list of attendees at the Job walk on 7/29 be available soon?

City Response #21: The list for each of the 2 mandatory pre-bid meetings is posted on the project website in the Phase 2 section.

Bidder Question #22: What is Bid item 144 "Trucking Fill for MSE Wall (City Supplied)" for? Does the City include trucking for this material delivered to the jobsite?

City Response #22: The item has been deleted per Addendum #2, Item #3.

Bidder Question #23: Pay items are not in order and there are some items with duplicate pay item numbers. Please clarify and/or correct.

City Response #23: Please refer to Addendum #2, Item #3.

Bidder Question #24: Item 22 "Control and Neutral Conductors" has a unit of measure "ALLOW". Is this an allowance item? What is the dollar amount? Please clarify and/or correct.

City Response #24: Please refer to Addendum #2, Item #3.

Bidder Question #25: Are items 107 and 108 the same? They have the same description "Adjust Valves to Grade", but one is 8 LF and one is 10EA? Please clarify and/or correct.

City Response #25: Please refer to Addendum #2, Item #3.

Bidder Question #26: Regarding the bridge girders. Drawings S-106 & S-107 call up the bearing pad size as 18" x 16" x 1'. Drawings S-110 & S-112 say 18" x 14" x 1 1/2". Please confirm the correct bearing pad dimensions.

City Response #26: Please refer to Addendum #4, Item #2.

Bidder Question #27: The BB and EB elevations shown along the profile grade of the A line on sheet S-101 do not appear to agree with the profile grade elevations shown on sheet C-105. Is it possible to get a bridge deck contour sheet? This would assist in getting heights of the abut seats and wing walls also.

City Response #27: We believe the bidder meant to reference Sheet C-103, instead of Sheet C-105. The centerline profile elevations on Sheet S-101 are BB = 116.94 +/- and EB = 114.82 +/- . This is consistent with the centerline profile on Sheet C-103 match. The bridge has a centerline crown and the deck has a 2% cross slope away from the centerline crown. See "Typical Section" on Sheet S-101. A bidder may calculate elevations based on this information.

Bidder Question #28: Sheet S-108 has a note on the Typical Wingwall Section stating that there is 1.5" fractured fin as shown on Abut. Details #4 sheet. No details are shown on Abut. Details #4 sheet. If the wingwall has architectural finish, does the City want the MSE wall panels to match also? Please clarify and/or correct.

City Response #28: Please refer to Addendum #4, Items #3 and #9.

Bidder Question #29: We are unable to find any information regarding the Surface Finish of the MSE Wall Panels listed in the contract documents. Could you please clarify?

City Response #29: Please refer to Addendum #4, Item #9.

Bidder Question #30: As there are only approximately four trains per day, can the precast concrete bridge girders be erected during normal daytime hours, or should they be erected at night?

City Response #30: There are no restrictions on when the girders are to be erected. However, this work will must be coordinated with BNSF Railway's operations.

Bidder Question #31: Street lighting plan sheet E-101 states that the dotted line symbol ----- stands for conduit placed by the contractor, however it is never specified what size and type this conduit should be.

City Response #31: Please refer to Addendum #4, Item # 4.

Bidder Question #32: What do bid items 151 & 156 entail. The work described under those two bid items on page E-121 of the specifications is already included in the other bid items (150, 152, 153, 155, 157 and 158).

City Response #32: Please refer to Addendum #4, Item # 5.

Bidder Question #33: Plan sheet E-101 states that all street light poles shall be furnished by contractor/installed by SCE. Specification page E-121 states that installation of the street lights shall be included by the contractor in bid items 150 & 155. Please clarify who will be furnishing the street lights & who will be installing the street lights.

City Response #33: Please refer to Addendum #4, Item # 4.

Bidder Question #34: Plan sheet E-101 states that conduit will be installed by the contractor and wires will be installed by SCE. Specification page E-121 states that installation of the wire shall be included by the contractor. Please clarify who will be installing street light wire.

City Response #34: Please refer to Addendum #4, Items #4 and #5.

Bidder Question #35: Service point of connection is unknown at Del Amo & Maple and Del Amo & Mariner intersections.

City Response #35: Please refer to Addendum #5, Item #2.

Bidder Question #36: Who is responsible for paying SCE fees for this project? If the contractor is responsible, Is the city aware of how much this will cost?

City Response #36: Please refer to Addendum #4, Item #4 and #5.

Bidder Question #37: Will the over excavation shown in the typical sections be paid in item 41, unclassified excavation?

City Response #37: Please refer to Addendum #4, Item # 7.

Bidder Question #38: Bid items 150 and 155. Are the street lighting poles and fixtures furnished and installed by (SCE), the City or the Contractor?

City Response #38: Please refer to Addendum #4, Items #4, 5, 10, and 11. Street lights are to be furnished and installed by the SCE, and the wiring will be installed by SCE for the SCE street lights.

Bidder Question #39: Street Lighting sheet 1 of 9 Under symbols (_ _ _ _), conduit to be installed by contractor and wire by (SCE) but in bid items 151 and 153 page E-121 Section 86-3.3 of the Specification, Payment Lighting describes the wiring to be done by contractor. Please clarify if the wiring will be done by contractor or (SCE).

City Response #39: Please refer to Addendum #4, Item #4.

Bidder Question #40: Sheet 1 of 9 under Note 1: Poles and fixtures to be installed by Southern California Edison and under symbols Street light pole, luminaries, conduit, wire and PB #5 to be done by (SCE). Please clarify who is doing this items and if Southern California Edison is responsible for any of the items please provide a (SCE) contact information so we can get a quote from them.

City Response #40: Please refer to Addendum #4, Items #4, #10, and #11.

Bidder Question #41: Items 151 and 153, 156 and 158 describes the same work, please clarify.

City Response #41: Please refer to Addendum #4, Item #5.

Bidder Question #42: (Referencing Plan Sheet 49, 51, and 52) Legend shows pull boxes to be of No. 6 size. Plans on the other hand only show portion of the total pull boxes to be of No. 6 size. Are all pull boxes of No. 6 size/type?

City Response #42: All pull boxes shown on the plans, unless otherwise noted, shall be considered to be No. 6 size pull boxes.

Bidder Question #43: (Referencing Plan Sheet 51 of 134) Plans call out to install 3 inch conduit, 6pr #19 I/C to Prairie (callout on the north east corner of Mariner Ave & Del Amo Blvd), but fails to identify the length of the run, nor stations are shown in order to be able to get a reference point. Please provide Length of the Signal Interconnect run.

City Response #43: Bidders shall use a length of 1,410 LF for the new 3-inch conduit to be installed. The new conduit will begin in the new No. 6 Pullbox at the northeast corner of Del Amo Blvd at Mariner Ave and extend easterly, with interim pull boxes, to an existing pullbox at the northwest corner of the Del Amo/Prairie intersection and then continue easterly across Prairie Ave to an existing pullbox at the northeast corner. The interconnect conductor will terminate at the controller box at the northeast corner of the Del Amo Blvd/Prairie Ave intersection and have a minimum of 10 linear feet of "slack" coiled into each pull box along the conduit run.

Bidder Question #44: (Referencing to Plan Sheet 52 of 134) Plans fail to identify Opticom Detectors. Should Opticom detectors be provided for the intersection? Per the plans we assume that EVP Opticom detectors are not required.

City Response #44: Opticom Detectors are not required for this intersection.

Bidder Question #45: (Referencing to Plan Sheet 52 of 134) Plans fail to identify any connection to other Signal Interconnect System. Should the signal system at Del Amo Ave and Madrid Ave have any Interconnect run and cable?

City Response #45: There will be no interconnect conduit runs for this intersection.

Bidder Question #46: (Referencing to Plan Sheet 123 of 134) The symbol legend of dashed line calls out that the conduit to be placed by contractor and wire by SCE. Looking at the Spec Section 86-8.03 the second item (page E-121) calls out that the item shall include wiring. Should the contractor be furnishing/installing any wiring and if so what type and size?

City Response #46: Please refer to Addendum #4, Item # 4.

Bidder Question #47: (Referencing the Spec Section 86-2.05E Streetlight conduit) The third paragraph states that the two lump sum bid items (Conduit, wire, trench, & backfill (SCE) and Conduit, wire, trench & backfill (City)) shall include hand holes, pull boxes, and street light cut-outs. Should then the bid item No. 152 pull boxes (SCE) be included into Lump Sum bid item No.153 (Conduit, wire, trench, & backfill (SCE))?

City Response #47: Please refer to Addendum #4, Item #4, #10, and #11.

Bidder Question #48: Referencing to Spec Section 86-2.05E Street Light Conduit) In this section the first paragraph states that the conduit shall be PVC Type. Under section 86-2.05A we find under the first and second paragraphs that conduit shall be Type 1 GRC. Please clarify the requirement of the SCE Lighting conduit and also the City Lighting Conduit.

City Response #48: Street light conduit to be installed underground (not less than 30" below grade) and not within the Bridge Structure, shall be Schedule 40 PVC material. Conduit to be encased in the barrier on the Bridge Structure shall be Rigid Metal Type as stated on Plan Sheet E-101. The street lighting to be installed on the MSE walls and associated conduit/conductor within the Bridge Structure will be owned by the City and all other street lights and associated conduits/conductor will be owned by SCE.

Bidder Question #49: (Referencing Plan Sheet 49) The Traffic Signal Pole Schedule identifies at Location D to furnish and install a Type 15 Pole. Further, at this location there is to be installed a traffic signal and a pedestrian signal which typically should be placed on a type 15TS Pole. Also, the schedule fails to identify the luminaire that is shown on the 4plans on this type 15 pole. Should this pole be type 15TS with a luminaire?

City Response #49: Pole D shall be a Type 15 per the Caltrans 2006 Revised Standard Plan RSP ES-6A which can be found at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/esc/oe/project_plans/HTM/stdplns-US-customary-units-new06.htm Pole D shall include a 250W luminaire, although it's not indicated on the plan. All other equipment associated with Pole D shall be per the Pole Schedule on said plan sheet. The City is not aware of the classification of "15TS."

Bidder Question #50: In the job walk this morning I ask you the question who is to remove the existing track? You answered was BNSF, but on the plan notes others? Would you please be more specific?

City Response #50: When a plan note states "BY OTHERS", this work is considered not included in this Contract.

Bidder Question #51: Section 316-3.05 RAIL You spec. calls out for relay 115 lb.-RE rail, in 80 foot lengths. This isn't a stand length rail section. The BNSF stander length rails start at 33 to 39 feet long. This track is at the end of the line and it is serving one customer. You should not have to use this premium length rail for this type of construction. I have enclosed the latest BNSF railroad spec. for track construction for you to review.

City Response #51: Please refer to Addendum #5, Item #11.

Bidder Question #52: Section 306-1.3, Sheet E-99, states that trenches greater than 2' shall be backfilled with suitable import material with an SE of 30. Does the city want imported materials used in the trench zone from 1' above pipe to sub grade? Please clarify.

City Response #52: Please refer to Addendum #5, Item #9.

Bidder Question #53: Standard drawing T116, note 2A, states that native material with an SE value of 30 or greater is acceptable for backfill. Is the native material acceptable for backfill over the storm drain lines. Please clarify.

City Response #53: Refer to the Special Provisions Section 306-1.3.1 and Addendum #5, Item #9.

Bidder Question #54: Section 306-1.3, sheet E-100, states that “in-situ” material is suitable for backfill on this site for storm drain pipelines. Does this mean the native is suitable for trench backfill or does this mean that the existing native soils are to be mixed on site to have vapors extracted and air, or chemicals injected, and then used for backfill? Please clarify.

City Response #54: City has tested the in-situ/native material on the job site and has determined it is suitable for use as backfill on this job site. The testing that was performed determined that the material exhibited concentrations below the RSLs/CHHSLs for industrial/commercial sites and was deemed acceptable for reuse as fill material on this site. However, the structural properties of the in-situ/native soil, do not allow it to be used “as-is” for structural backfill for the MSE Wall.

PLEASE NOTE: The Contractor is advised that this job site is located in an industrial zone, on railroad property and near a refinery, and should note the increase in the risk of encountering hazardous material. Therefore, the contractor is to monitor for hazardous material in accordance with their Health & Safety Guidelines for potentially hazardous material and their Rule 1166 AQMD Mitigation Plan. As such, should the Contractor encounter any “Soil Contamination” as defined in Section 3-4.1 of the Special Provisions, the Contractor shall follow their Health & Safety Plan and Mitigation Plan for the handling and disposal of the Contaminated Soil.

Bidder Question #55: You have probably heard about the instability of the I-girders for this project. Our understanding is that Moffatt and Nichol will issue an addendum to deal with this issue. We have not heard anything yet. If the bid stays with the girders as they are we will not bid the project.

City Response #55: The City intends to bid/build the project as designed. We have spoken to several fabricators about this issue and there is at least one that will fabricate the I-girders per our plan. We are aware of the need for stabilizing the girder during transport and installation and that should be included in the bid price. There will be no Addendum to modify the design.

Bidder Question #56: Addendum 4, item 6 states material in the on-site stockpile cannot be used for backfill of the MSE walls. There is excess dirt from other areas on the job, can it be used for this backfill or does it have to be exported and all MSE backfill be imported?

City Response #56: Please refer to Addendum #6, Item #1.

Bidder Question #57: If all excess excavated dirt must be exported, will the city accept the excess at the city yard?

City Response #57: All excess excavated dirt does not have to be exported. Please refer to Addendum #6, Item #1.

Bidder Question #58: What method will the city use to calculate the quantity of over excavated dirt move for payment as unclassified excavation?

City Response #58: Please refer to Addendum #6, Item #1.

Bidder Question #59: Respectfully, while your response to "Bidder Question # 9" clarifies the allotted RR flagging hours for the new track construction, nothing is mentioned about flagging for the bridge construction. Can you please clarify if the city is covering RR flagging costs associated with the bridge construction or is the contractor to include such costs in the bid price? If the contractor is to include the costs, what is the rate per day or per hour?

City Response #59: Please refer to Addendum #7, Items #1 and #2.

Bidder Question #60: I am bidding this project Del Amo Blvd. Extension for the landscaping scope of work. I need to check with you what are the necessary permit I will be needing as well as the fees. Thank you so much and hope to hear from you soon.

City Response #60: There is no required permit for the landscaping work and also no fee.

Bidder Question #61: Does the City have any objection to utilizing metal, leave-in-place deck forms?

City Response #61: The City will permit the use of metal, leave-in-place deck forms provided the forms are fully secured and will not disconnect and fall at any time onto the tracks below. Should corrugated metal deck forms be utilized, the minimum deck thickness shall be not less than the thickness indicated on the plans.

Bidder Question #62: Since addendum #4 states that SCE will be responsible for furnishing and installing their poles shouldn't B.I. #150 be omitted?

City Response #62: Yes, refer to Addendum #7, Item #3.

Bidder Question #63: On page 12 Section 5.1.4 of the Geotechnical Report, the last sentence States, " Therefore, a minimum settlement period of one month after fill placement and prior to pile construction is considered appropriate." Construction, Removal and maintenance of a settlement is not addressed anywhere in the project specifications.

City Response #63: Bidders are instructed not to include a cost in their bid for this. Should settlement occur, the City will evaluate the settlement and determine any needed solution. Consequently, should the contractor be required to perform work for this item, said work will be paid as force account work.

Bidder Question #64: Drawing D-105 shows a PCC Triangular Channel. Where is this item paid?

City Response #64: Bid Item 64 - REINF. CONC. TRIANGULAR OPEN CHANNEL

City Disclaimer: The City's response to any bidder's inquiry/RFI is provided only for clarification to said inquiry/RFI with the sole intention of providing a bidder with information that may or may not assist him/her with the preparation of his/her bid. The City's response is considered not part of, or an amendment to, the Project's Specifications and Special Provisions, unless otherwise included or amended via an Addendum.